

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,475	04/13/2001	Paul L. Mullen	GEMS8081.070	7317
27061	7590 05/17/2005		EXAMINER	
ZIOLKOWSKI PATENT SOLUTIONS GROUP, SC (GEMS) 14135 NORTH CEDARBURG ROAD			LANEAU,	RONALD
MEQUON, V		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 05/17/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/681,475	MULLEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ronald Laneau	3627				
The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutance of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recitation. days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT, by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on <u>14 February 2005</u> .					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are rejected. 7)☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection	- · · ·	·				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including th 11) The oath or declaration is objected to b	•					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	ocuments have been received. Incuments have been received in Aporthe priority documents have been to be all Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO		ummary (PTO-413) /Mail Date				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

1. The amendment filed on 01/21/05 has been entered. Claims 1-34 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Worley (US

6,651,190 B1) in view of Wetzer (US 6,378,748 B2).

Worley discloses a system and method for remotely managing communication of

electronic data between a diagnostic service center and a plurality of machines generally remote

relative to each other including the steps of remotely collecting condition data representative of a

device status (see abstract); storing the condition data on a database (database server) at a

centralized facility; reviewing the condition data (see col. 10, lines 4-8); and displaying it on a

graphical user interface 406 (col. 3, lines 16-26), Worley further teaches that the statistic log may

be configured so that the graphical user interface allows for user-friendly manipulation of data

and for example generation of reports may be implemented in graphical and/or tabular format

with electronic editing, copying, cutting and pasting options (col. 14, lines 4-9), a system that

may be configured to generate periodic reports, e.g., weekly, monthly, etc based on the log of

diagnostic statistics and the report may be configured to be distributed through the Internet or an

intranet via a predetermined Web server (col. 14, lines 26-33), a system that is capable of being

Application/Control Number: 09/681,475

Art Unit: 3627

programmed to acquire the condition data and the reminder data via a LAN, a WAN, a telephone system, a cable communication system, and a wireless system as claimed (cols. 5-6, lines 19-23), the system of Worley would allow operators to monitor downloads in process and/or in queue and identify the type of download as claimed. Furthermore, Worley discloses notifying service technician that service is required on some components (col. 9, lines 32-36).

Worley does not teach that the GUI displays the time of the next scheduled maintenance but Wetzer teaches the step of storing data processing of components on components of an equipment, said data processing system associates at least one predictive maintenance factor (for a component) with the corresponding component data, a scheduler schedules maintenance for a maintenance time period for at least one of the components based on the first database, the second database, the associated predictive maintenance factor, and an elapsed time with respect to an installation date of at least one component, said predictive maintenance factor may be defined by one or more of the following: a longevity estimate, a probability of failure, a financial estimate on maintenance of a component (see abs), updating the maintenance file record to reflect the diagnosis, the schedule for service, etc (col. 1, lines 31-43). Furthermore, the system of Wetzer is well capable of tailoring the display for a particular user as claimed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teachings of Wetzer into the system of Worley because it would provide ways to track diagnostic data of devices to ensure they are in proper working order.

None of the references teaches marketing data, customer-entered data, and messages are consolidated. However, these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and do not alter how the information is consolidated. Thus, this descriptive material will

Art Unit: 3627

not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see In re

Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983): In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579,

32 USPQ 2d 1031 (Fed Cir 1994). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to consolidate marketing data, customer-

entered data, and messages because the type of information being consolidated does not

patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant has faxed in an interview summary on March 11, 2005 stating that Examiner

Laneau has found claims 1-11 to be allowable and requested the Attorney to cancel claims 12-33.

In response, Examiner Laneau has no recollection that such a discussion ever took place as

claims 1-11 contain no allowable subject matter.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (703) 305-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/681,475

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Page 5

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Laneau

Examiner

Art Unit 3627

rl